Pairwise Markov properties for regression graphs

Kayvan Sadeghi
University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

Nanny Wermuth
Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg, Sweden and Gutenberg-University, Mainz, Germany

arXiv:1512.09016v1 [math.ST] 30 Dec 2015

Abstract: With sequences of regressions, one may generate joint probability distributions. One starts with a marginal distribution of context variables of concentration graph structure and continues with ordered sequences of conditional distributions, named regressions in joint responses. The involved random variables may be discrete, continuous or of both type. Such a generating process determines for each response the conditioning set containing its regressor variables and an ordering of the node set in the corresponding regression graph with three types of edge. This graph contains different possible types of pairwise Markov properties, which interpret the conditional independence associated with a missing edge in the graph. We explain how these properties arise and prove their equivalence for compositional graphoids.

1 Introduction

Regression graph models are the subclass of graphical Markov models that is best suited to capture pathways of development, no matter whether the generating process arises in observational studies or in intervention studies, see Wermuth (2015). For prospective studies, time provides a partial ordering of a finite number of variables and leads to an ordered sequence of joint and single response variables. In other studies, any ordering is provisional but, typically, may be agreed upon by researchers in the given field of study.

Regression graph models extend models proposed by Cox and Wermuth (1993), illustrated there with several small sets of data having some joint responses and just linear relations; see e.g. Weisberg (2014). Additional in regression graph models are context variables which capture baseline features of study individuals or of study conditions. Context variables may be controlled or fixed by study design. Regression graphs represent an essential extension of fully directed acyclic graphs whenever one wants to model that explanatory variables affect directly, at the same time, several response variables.

Individual random variables can be continuous, discrete or of both types. For such mixed responses, the conditional distributions may, for instance, be conditional Gaussian(CG) regressions; see Lauritzen and Wermuth (1989), be approximated by generalized linear regressions; see McCullagh and Nelder (1989), Andersen and Skovgaard (2010), or if needed, be any other type of more specialized nonlinear regression, which permits to represent the relevant conditional independences.

For discrete variables, ordered sequences of joint regressions without context variables were studied as chain graph models of type IV by Drton (2009). A parameterization and maximum-likelihood estimates were derived by Marchetti and Lupparelli (2011). For discrete context variables, the types of joint distribution have been studied by Darroch, Lauritzen and Speed (1980), named later discrete concentration graph models for which single unobserved variables can be identified; see Stanghellini and Vantaggi (2013) and fitting strategies are available; see Sadeghi and Marchetti (2012).

In general, the independence structure of context variables is to be generated over a probabilistic undirected graph in vertex set $V = \{1, \ldots, d_V\}$ and edge set E, known as the concentration graph. The name reminds one that for regular joint Gaussian distributions, a missing edge for node pair i, j shows as an ij-zero in its concentration matrix, the inverse covariance matrix; see Dempster (1972), Cox and Wermuth (1993). In general, an edge couples two nodes, say i, j, and each missing ij-edge means X_i is independent of X_j given the remaining variables. This is written compactly in terms of nodes as $i \perp\!\!\!\perp j | V \setminus \{i, j\}$; see Dawid (1979).

In a single joint response regression, a directed conditional dependence arises for each single response component, X_i, when it is predicted by a given vector of regressors, say $\boldsymbol{R}_i$ which may include not only single variables but response surfaces, defined e.g. via $X_j, X_j^2, X_j^3, \ldots$, or $X_j, X_k, X_j * X_k, \ldots$; see Ezekiel (1926), Box and Wilson (1951), Cox and Wermuth (1994). Each X_j of $\boldsymbol{R}_i$ has a non-vanishing dependence given the remaining regressors of X_i. A further undirected dependence may result for a pair X_i, X_j within a joint response, that is for a dependence that remains among them after their multivariate regression on the union of their regressors.

Accordingly, for regression graphs in node set $N = \{1, \ldots d\}$, where each node represents a variable, the edge set contains in general three types of edge of different interpretation. The ij-edge among two context nodes is denoted by a full line, i —— j. Edges for directed dependences are ij-arrows, $i \prec\!\!- j$. Each ij-arrow starts at a regressor node j and points to a response i. The ij-edge between two individual response nodes within a given joint response is denoted by a dashed line, i- - -j. Undirected graphs of this type are named conditional covariance graphs to remind one that for joint Gaussian distributions, a missing ij-edge shows as an ij-zero in the conditional covariance matrix of a joint response $X := (X_1, \ldots X_p)$, given the union of its individual regressors.

Independence properties implied by the standard graph theoretic separation criterion on graphs listed here as (i) to (v) in Section 3, were introduced by Pearl and Paz (1987) for concentration graphs and said to define a graphoid. More importantly, they derived that for graphoids all independences implied by the given graph, may be obtained either from the list of independences defined by its missing edges or by separation in undirected graphs. This became known later as the equivalence of the pairwise Markov property and the global Markov property. Such an equivalence has been proven for

more general classes of graphs including regression graphs for which the global Markov property is also generalized; see Sadeghi and Lauritzen (2014). This uses the additional independence property of composition, listed here as property (vi) in Section 4. For such compositional graphoids, several pairwise Markov properties may be defined, which give several independence interpretations to a missing edge.

Here we show with respect to regression graphs, that four different pairwise Markov properties are equivalent. Thus, any one of the four pairwise properties characterizes the regression-graph structure, that is all independences implied by a given regression graph, can be derived from each of these properties.

In Section 2, we introduce more definitions and concepts for regression graphs. In Section 3, we motivate regression-graph structures as arising with stepwise data-generating processes. In Section 4, we provide and discuss independence properties. In Section 5, we give four pairwise Markov properties for regression graphs and prove their equivalence for compositional graphoids. We end with a discussion in Section 6.

2 Some definitions and concepts for regression graphs

A simple graph with a finite node set $N = \{1, \ldots, d\}$ has in its edge set E at most one ij-edge for nodes i, j in N. When i, j are the endpoints of an edge, the node pair is said to be coupled or to be adjacent and denoted by $i \sim j$. A simple graph is complete when all pairs are coupled by an edge.

A parent of node i is the starting node j of an arrow pointing to i. The set of parents of node i is denoted by $\mathrm{par}(i)$. A path between nodes i and j is a sequence of edges passing through distinct inner nodes, connecting the endpoints i and j of the path. By convention, an ij-edge is the shortest type of path.

A subgraph induced by a subset a of N has as the node set a and as edges those present in the graph among the nodes of a. In undirected graphs, a complete subgraph is called a clique. A subgraph is connected if there is a path between any two of its nodes i and j and it is disconnected, otherwise. A maximally connected subgraph is called a connected component.

A direction-preserving path from j to i consists of arrows, all pointing in the same direction, towards i. In a direction-preserving path from j to i, node j is named an ancestor of i and node i a descendant of j. An anterior path consists of an undirected path among context nodes and a direction preserving path, such as:



The set of anterior nodes of node i is denoted by $\mathrm{ant}(i)$.

The regression graph, G^N_{reg}, is a simple graph with a finite node set N, having three different types of edge. Here we use full lines, arrows and dashed lines. The latter are in some literature replaced by double-headed arrows, called arcs. Regression graphs have the following properties: (1) there is no arrowhead pointing to a full line, (2) the connected components $g_1, \ldots, g_Q$, consist of dashed lines (called response components), and result from a given G^N_{reg} by removing all arrows, all full-line edges and their coupled nodes and (3) these components can be ordered in a such way that $g_q < g_l$ if there is an arrow pointing from a node in g_l to a node in g_q.

The induced subgraph of G^N_{reg} that consists of only full lines is called the context set, g_v. The induced subgraph of G^N_{reg} that consists of only arrows and dashed lines is called the response set, g_u. The context set has a higher order than the connected components of the response sets. For a given ordering, a node in g_l is said to be in the past of a node in g_q if $q < l$. Thus, for a node i in the response set g_q, its past is denoted by $\text{pst}(i) = g_{>q}$.

Although the ordering of the components of regression graphs are essential for the theory, one can indeed extend a valid ordering for components to a complete valid ordering $(1, \ldots, N)$ for the nodes, where if $i \in g_q$ and $j \in g_l$ and $q < l$ then $i < j$. This implies that if there is an arrow from j to i then $i < j$. Parents and ancestors of node i are in the past of i. Notice that the past of a node does not include the nodes from the same components even if they have a larger order.

Conditional independences are captured by missing edges in G^N_{reg}. A missing edge for i, j in G^N_{reg} is denoted by $i \nsim j$. For $i \nsim j$, there is some subset c of $N \setminus \{i, j\}$ such that in the graph X_i is conditionally independent of X_j given X_c, written as $i \perp\!\!\!\perp j|c$. Regression graphs may arise from a given generating process as described next.

3 Sequences of regressions that lead to regression graphs

When sequences of regressions are to capture developmental processes, which start from a given set of context vector variables, $\boldsymbol{X}_v$, and proceed via sets of intermediate responses to the response of main interest, $\boldsymbol{X}_1$, then an ordering of the nodes arises from the substantive context and is one of possibly several valid orderings that can be defined using just the graph.

The union of the sequence of responses, $\boldsymbol{X}_q$ for $q = 1, \ldots, Q$, is denoted by $\boldsymbol{X}_u$. The variables intermediate between $\boldsymbol{X}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{X}_v$ may for instance be treatments, risk assessments and other measurements or events expected to influence the development up to the responses of main interest, such as shown in Fig. 1.



Figure 1: *A typical ordering of vector variables for a regression graph model.*

A joint density, f_N, is said to be generated over a regression graph, $G^N_{\rm reg}$ if the distribution factorizes according to the graph and for a given ordering of all nodes, every edge present in the graph corresponds to a pairwise conditional dependence.

We write in a condensed notation, the conditional density of $\boldsymbol{X}_u$ given $\boldsymbol{X}_v$ as $f_{u|v}$ and the marginal density of $\boldsymbol{X}_v$ as f_v. An ordering as in Fig. 1 gives then

$$f_N = f_{u|v} f_v, \qquad f_{u|v} = \prod_{q=1}^{Q} f_{g_q|g_{>q}}. \tag{1}$$

For $i \sim j$ in $G^N_{\rm reg}$ arising with statistical analyses for equations (1),

$$\begin{aligned} &i\text{---}j \text{ has } i,j \text{ in } g_q\text{:} && i \pitchfork j|g_{>q}\ , \\ &i \prec\!\!\!\text{—} j \text{ has } i \text{ in } g_q \text{ and } j \text{ in } g_{>q}\text{:} && i \pitchfork j|g_{>q} \setminus \{j\}\ , \\ &i \text{——} j \text{ has } i,j \text{ in } g_v\text{:} && i \pitchfork j|g_v \setminus \{i,j\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\pitchfork$ indicates a non-vanishing dependence. We therefore also say that $G^N_{\rm reg}$ is edge-minimal for f_N since no edge in the graph may be removed without ignoring a conditional dependence which is important in the generating process. This definition of the conditional dependences uses implicitly Theorem 1 below, since in addition to the global factorizations in equation (1), each missing edge for a pair i, j means an independence with $\pitchfork$ replaced above by $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ and hence an additional factorization.

For a given generated f_N, the distribution may satisfy additional independences due to parametric cancellations; for examples see e.g. Wermuth (2012). Thus, the regression-graph structure contains those independences which hold in f_N irrespective of the parametrization of the generated distribution.

For a generating process, the distribution is required to be generated over an edge-minimal $G^N_{\rm reg}$. To use such a graph for tracing dependences, the generated distribution has to satisfy an additional independence property, listed as (vii) in Section 4. However, for the results in this paper, the distribution need not be generated over an edge-minimal regression graph. It just has to satisfy two properties that are not common to all probability distributions, discussed in the next section as (v) and (vi).

4 Independence properties

The following properties have been defined for conditional independences of probability distributions. Let a, b, d, c be disjoint subsets of N, where c may be the empty set and, when i, j, k are nodes of N, then c is a subset of $N \setminus \{i, j, k\}$:

(i) symmetry: $a \perp\!\!\!\perp b|c \Longrightarrow b \perp\!\!\!\perp a|c\,;$

(*ii*) decomposition: $a \perp\!\!\!\perp bd|c \Longrightarrow (a \perp\!\!\!\perp b|c \text{ and } a \perp\!\!\!\perp d|c)$;

(*iii*) weak union: $a \perp\!\!\!\perp bd|c \Longrightarrow (a \perp\!\!\!\perp b|dc \text{ and } a \perp\!\!\!\perp d|bc)$;

(*iv*) contraction: $(a \perp\!\!\!\perp b|dc \text{ and } a \perp\!\!\!\perp d|c) \iff i \perp\!\!\!\perp bd|c$;

(*v*) intersection: $(a \perp\!\!\!\perp d|bc \text{ and } a \perp\!\!\!\perp b|dc) \Longrightarrow a \perp\!\!\!\perp bd|c$;

(*vi*) composition: $(a \perp\!\!\!\perp d|c \text{ and } a \perp\!\!\!\perp b|c) \Longrightarrow a \perp\!\!\!\perp bd|c$.

Note that composition defines the reverse direction of decomposition. Intersection gives the reverse direction of weak union.

Properties (*i*) to (*iv*) are the independence properties of all probability distributions; see Dawid (1979), Studený (1989). The first five independence properties, listed above, give the graphoids of Pearl and Paz (1987), see also Studený (1989, 2005). If, in addition, the composition property holds, one speaks of a compositional graphoid. The same properties are satisfied by G^N_{reg}. In addition, for compositional graphoids, pairwise independences can be combined to obtain global independence statements of the type $a \perp\!\!\!\perp b|c$; see Sadeghi and Lauritzen (2014).

The above six properties are used in the proof of Theorem 1 here. There is also

(*vii*) singleton transitivity: $(j \perp\!\!\!\perp k|c \text{ and } j \perp\!\!\!\perp k|i,c) \Longrightarrow (i \perp\!\!\!\perp j|c \text{ or } i \perp\!\!\!\perp k|c)$.

Probability distributions which satisfy properties (*i*) to (*vii*) are for instance regular joint Gaussian distributions; see Lněnička and Matúš (2007). For other than Gaussian distributions, these seven properties of a density generated over G^N_{reg} ensure that the graph may be used to trace pathways of dependence, see Wermuth (2012, 2015). Such sequences of regressions have therefore been said to be traceable.

Even then, parametric cancellations are possible, that is independences in the generated distribution may occur in addition to those of the regression-graph structure. However, in the special case of a totally positive distribution, generated over an edge-minimal regression graph, which is Markov equivalent to its overall concentration graph, one has traceability and, in addition, the regression-graph structure coincides with the independence structure of the generated distribution; see Fallat et al. (2015).

Though the independence properties above are well known, it is helpful to visualize them in terms of graphs. As an example, we explain with Fig. 2 contraction by removing two edges in a concentration graph for four variables, where c contains a single node.



Figure 2: *Concentration graphs in nodes* $1,2,3,c$, *left:* $1 \perp\!\!\!\perp 3|\{2,c\}$; *right:* $1 \perp\!\!\!\perp \{2,3\}|c$.

With $1 \perp\!\!\!\perp 3|\{2,c\}$ holding in a concentration graph, the graph has two three-node cliques, that is maximally complete subsets: $\{1,2,c\}$ and $\{2,3,c\}$. The set separating

nodes 1 and 3 is $\{2, c\}$. Accordingly, the joint density factorizes as $f_N = f_{12c} f_{3|2c}$. With the additional independence $1 \perp\!\!\!\perp 2|c$, the graph reduces to the cliques $\{1, c\}$, $\{2, 3, c\}$ with just c separating 1 from 2, 3. The reverse direction follows from the factorization corresponding to the graph on the right.

Composition implies, for instance, that in a complete regression graph of Fig. 3 with joint response $\{1, 2\}$ and possible regressors 3 and c, removing both arrows starting at node 3 and pointing to nodes 1 and 2 leaves $\{1, 2\} \perp\!\!\!\perp 3|c$, that is the independences $1 \perp\!\!\!\perp 3|c$ and $2 \perp\!\!\!\perp 3|c$ combine upwards to the larger conditioning sets $1 \perp\!\!\!\perp 3|\{2, c\}$ and $2 \perp\!\!\!\perp 3|\{1, c\}$, as an implication of $\{1, 2\} \perp\!\!\!\perp 3|c$.



Figure 3: *Edge-minimal regression graphs with joint response* $\{1, 2\}$ *and regressors* 3 *and* c*, left: no independences and e.g.* $1 \not\perp\!\!\!\perp 3|c$*; and* $2 \not\perp\!\!\!\perp 3|c$ *right:* $\{1, 2\} \perp\!\!\!\perp 3|c$.

Similarly intersection implies, for instance, that in a complete regression graph of Fig. 4 with ordered single responses $(1, 2)$ and possible regressors 3 and c, removing both, the 1, 2-arrow and the 1, 3-arrow, leaves $1 \perp\!\!\!\perp \{2, 3\}|c$, that is the independences $1 \perp\!\!\!\perp 2|\{3, c\}$ and $1 \perp\!\!\!\perp 3|\{2, c\}$ combine downwards to the smaller conditioning sets $1 \perp\!\!\!\perp 2|c$ and $1 \perp\!\!\!\perp 3|c$, as an implication of $1 \perp\!\!\!\perp \{2, 3\}|c$.



Figure 4: *Edge-minmal regression graphs with ordered single responses* $(1, 2)$ *and regressors* $3, c$*, left: no independences and e.g.* $1 \not\perp\!\!\!\perp 2|\{3, c\}$ *and* $1 \not\perp\!\!\!\perp 3|\{2, c\}$*; right:* $1 \perp\!\!\!\perp \{2, 3\}|c$.

The focus of this paper is on pairwise independences and from the above discussion, we list first an intuitive description of the compositional graphoid properties for pairwise independences in regression graphs. These decompositions are shared also by traceable regressions; see Wermuth (2012).

Proposition 1. *For a distribution that is a compositional graphoid, the independence* $i \perp\!\!\!\perp \{j, k\}|c$ *is equivalent to the following three decompositions:*

$$(i \perp\!\!\!\perp k|jc \text{ and } i \perp\!\!\!\perp j|c) \iff (i \perp\!\!\!\perp k|c \text{ and } i \perp\!\!\!\perp j|c) \iff (i \perp\!\!\!\perp j|kc \text{ and } i \perp\!\!\!\perp k|jc).$$

5 Pairwise Markov properties for regression graphs

Let G^N_{reg} be a regression graph with a valid ordering of the node set $N = (1, \ldots, d)$ (which conforms with a valid ordering of its components). Based on this ordering, in

this section we always assume that, for the node pair i, j, $i < j$. For parents, anteriors and the past of node pair i, j we use the following notation:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{par}(i,j) &= \text{par}(i) \cup \text{par}(j) \setminus \{i,j\}, \\ \text{ant}(i,j) &= \text{ant}(i) \cup \text{ant}(j) \setminus \{i,j\}, \\ \text{pst}(i,j) &= \text{pst}(i) \cup \text{pst}(j) \setminus \{i,j\}. \end{aligned}$$

We now define the following pairwise Markov properties for G^N_{reg}:

The distribution $\mathcal{P}$ of $(X_n)_{n\in N}$ satisfies a pairwise Markov property (Pn), for $n = 1, 2, 3, 4$, with respect to G^N_{reg} if for i and j in the context set v,

$$i \not\sim j \quad \Longrightarrow \quad i \perp\!\!\!\perp j | v \setminus \{i,j\},,$$

and for i and j in the response set, or i in the response set and j in the context set,

$$\begin{aligned} (P1) : i \not\sim j \quad &\Longrightarrow \quad i \perp\!\!\!\perp j | \text{pst}(i,j)\,, \\ (P2) : i \not\sim j \quad &\Longrightarrow \quad i \perp\!\!\!\perp j | \text{ant}(i,j)\,, \\ (P3) : i \not\sim j \quad &\Longrightarrow \quad i \perp\!\!\!\perp j | \text{par}(i,j)\,, \\ (P4) : i \not\sim j \quad &\Longrightarrow \quad i \perp\!\!\!\perp j | \text{par}(i); \end{aligned}$$

Consider, for example, the graph of Fig. 5 with $N = (1, \ldots, 9)$.



Figure 5: A regression graph.

For the uncoupled pair of nodes $2, 4$, the nodes in its past are $\text{pst}(2,4) = \{5,6,7,8,9\}$, the anteriors are $\text{ant}(2,4) = \{5,6,8,9\}$, the parents are $\text{par}(2,4) = \{5,6\}$ while the parent of node 2 alone is node 5, so that by the four pairwise Markov properties

$$\begin{aligned} (P1) \quad &\Longrightarrow \quad 2 \perp\!\!\!\perp 4 | \{5,6,7,8,9\}; \\ (P2) \quad &\Longrightarrow \quad 2 \perp\!\!\!\perp 4 | \{5,6,8,9\}; \\ (P3) \quad &\Longrightarrow \quad 2 \perp\!\!\!\perp 4 | \{5,6\}; \\ (P4) \quad &\Longrightarrow \quad 2 \perp\!\!\!\perp 4 | 5. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 1. *Suppose that a distribution $\mathcal{P}$ of $(X_n)_{n\in N}$ is a compositional graphoid. Then, for every valid ordering of the nodes of G^N_{reg}, $\mathcal{P}$ satisfies $(P1) \iff (P2) \iff (P3) \iff (P4)$ with respect to G^N_{reg}.*

Before presenting the proof, we provide the following example related to the graph of Fig. 5, in which we follow at first the same method as in the proof of this theorem that is using compositional graphoid properties to obtain the equivalence of the independence statements implied by the different pairwise Markov properties:

$(P1) \Rightarrow (P2)$: By definition, we have $2 \perp\!\!\!\perp 4|\{5,6,7,8,9\}$ and $4 \perp\!\!\!\perp 7|\{5,6,8,9\}$. Contraction implies $4 \perp\!\!\!\perp \{2,7\}|\{5,6,8,9\}$. Then, decomposition gives that $2 \perp\!\!\!\perp 4|\{5,6,8,9\}$.

$(P2) \Rightarrow (P3)$: Nodes $6, 8$ and 9 are in the set $\text{ant}(2,4) \setminus \text{par}(2)$, and it holds that $2 \perp\!\!\!\perp 8|\{5,6,9\}$, $2 \perp\!\!\!\perp 9|\{5,6,8\}$, and $2 \perp\!\!\!\perp 6|\{5,8,9\}$. Intersection, used repeatedly, implies $2 \perp\!\!\!\perp \{6,8,9\}|5$. This together with $2 \perp\!\!\!\perp 4|\{5,6,8,9\}$ implies by contraction $2 \perp\!\!\!\perp \{4,6,8,9\}|5$. By decomposition, $2 \perp\!\!\!\perp \{4,6\}|5$ so that by weak union, $2 \perp\!\!\!\perp 4|\{5,6\}$.

$(P3) \Rightarrow (P4)$: By decomposition, we have from $2 \perp\!\!\!\perp \{4,6\}|5$ that $2 \perp\!\!\!\perp 6|5$. By contraction, this and $2 \perp\!\!\!\perp 4|\{5,6\}$ imply $2 \perp\!\!\!\perp \{4,6\}|5$ so that by decomposition $2 \perp\!\!\!\perp 4|5$.

$(P4) \Rightarrow (P1)$: Composition used repeatedly for statements $2 \perp\!\!\!\perp 4|5$, $2 \perp\!\!\!\perp 6|5$, $2 \perp\!\!\!\perp 7|5$, $2 \perp\!\!\!\perp 8|5$, $2 \perp\!\!\!\perp 9|5$ gives $2 \perp\!\!\!\perp \{4,6,7,8,9\}|5$. Weak union implies $2 \perp\!\!\!\perp 4|\{5,6,7,8,9\}$.

Proof of Theorem 1. $(P1) \Rightarrow (P2)$: By definition, $\text{pst}(i,j) = \text{pst}(i) \setminus \{j\}$. Let $k \in \{j\} \cup \text{pst}(i) \setminus (\text{ant}(i,j))$, then $k \nsim i$ and $i \perp\!\!\!\perp k|\text{pst}(i) \setminus \{k\}$. For another possible node $l \in \text{pst}(i) \setminus (\text{ant}(i,j))$, it holds also that $i \perp\!\!\!\perp l|\text{pst}(i) \setminus \{l\}$. By the intersection property, we obtain $i \perp\!\!\!\perp \{k,l\}|\text{pst}(i) \setminus \{k,l\}$. By the same method and an inductive argument, for all members of $\text{pst}(i) \setminus (\text{ant}(i,j))$, we obtain $i \perp\!\!\!\perp \text{pst}(i) \setminus (\text{ant}(i,j))|\text{ant}(i,j)$. Now if i and j are in different connected components then by the same method, we use the intersection property to obtain $i \perp\!\!\!\perp \{j\} \cup \text{pst}(i) \setminus (\text{ant}(i,j))|\text{ant}(i,j)$, and if i and j are in the same connected component, we use the contraction property with $i \perp\!\!\!\perp j|\text{pst}(i)$ to obtain the same independence statement. The decomposition property yields $i \perp\!\!\!\perp j|\text{ant}(i,j)$.

$(P2) \Rightarrow (P3)$: Suppose that i is in the lower or equal index component g_r than that of j. Let also $k \in \text{ant}(i,j) \setminus \text{par}(i)$. Notice that $k \nsim i$ since $k \notin \text{par}(i)$ and if, $k \in \text{ant}(j) \setminus \text{ant}(i)$ and adjacent to i then i is of a higher order than j, which is not possible. We prove that $i \perp\!\!\!\perp k|\text{ant}(i) \setminus \{k\}$:

If $k \in \text{ant}(i)$ then $\text{ant}(k) \subset \text{ant}(i)$ and subsequently $\text{ant}(i,k) = \text{ant}(i)$. The result is then obvious from the assumption. Thus assume that $k \in \text{ant}(j) \setminus \text{ant}(i)$. We then use reverse induction on the order of the connected components in which k lies to prove the claim. For the base, we have that k is in g_v, and let $g_{v,k}$ be the connected component containing k in g_v. It holds that $\text{ant}(k) = g_{v,k}$. For every member l of $g_{v,k}$, it holds that $i \perp\!\!\!\perp l|\text{ant}(i) \cup g_{v,k}$. By intersection, for all such statements, we obtain $i \perp\!\!\!\perp g_{v,k}|\text{ant}(i)$. Decomposition implies the result.

Now suppose that $k \in g_q$ and, for every $l \in \text{ant}(k) \setminus \text{ant}(i)$, by the induction hypothesis, it holds that $i \perp\!\!\!\perp l | \text{ant}(i)$. By the composition property for all such $i \perp\!\!\!\perp l | \text{ant}(i)$, we obtain that $i \perp\!\!\!\perp \text{ant}(k) | \text{ant}(i)$. This together with $i \perp\!\!\!\perp k | \text{ant}(i,k)$, by using the contraction property, implies that $i \perp\!\!\!\perp \{k\} \cup \text{ant}(k) | \text{ant}(i)$. The decomposition property gives $i \perp\!\!\!\perp k | \text{ant}(i)$.

Now by the intersection property for all such $i \perp\!\!\!\perp k | \text{ant}(i) \setminus \{k\}$, we obtain $i \perp\!\!\!\perp \text{ant}(i,j) \setminus \text{par}(i) | \text{par}(i)$. This together with $i \perp\!\!\!\perp j | \text{ant}(i,j)$, by using the contraction property, implies $i \perp\!\!\!\perp \{j\} \cup \text{ant}(i,j) \setminus \text{par}(i) | \text{par}(i)$. By the decomposition property, this gives $i \perp\!\!\!\perp \{j\} \cup \text{par}(j) \setminus \text{par}(i) | \text{par}(i)$. The weak union property now implies $i \perp\!\!\!\perp j | \text{par}(i,j)$.

$(P3) \Rightarrow (P4)$: We prove the result by reverse induction on the order of the connected component that contains j. If j is in g_v then the result trivially holds. Thus suppose that j lies in g_p. By induction hypothesis for each $k \in \text{par}(j) \setminus \text{par}(i)$ we have $i \perp\!\!\!\perp k | \text{par}(i)$. By the composition property, it is implied that $i \perp\!\!\!\perp \text{par}(j) \setminus \text{par}(i) | \text{par}(i)$. This together with $i \perp\!\!\!\perp j | \text{par}(i,j)$, by the contraction property, implies $i \perp\!\!\!\perp \{j\} \cup \text{par}(j) \setminus \text{par}(i) | \text{par}(i)$. The decomposition property now gives $i \perp\!\!\!\perp j | \text{par}(i)$.

$(P4) \Rightarrow (P1)$: Suppose that $k \in \{j\} \cup \text{pst}(i,j) \setminus \text{par}(i)$. We have that $k \nsim i$. Therefore, $i \perp\!\!\!\perp k | \text{par}(i)$. Using the composition property for all such statements for members of $\{j\} \cup \text{pst}(i,j) \setminus \text{par}(i)$, we obtain $i \perp\!\!\!\perp \{j\} \cup \text{pst}(i,j) \setminus \text{par}(i) | \text{par}(i)$. The weak union property implies $i \perp\!\!\!\perp j | \text{pst}(i.j)$. □

Based on the equivalence of the global Markov property and the pairwise Markov property $(P2)$, proven in Sadeghi and Lauritzen (2014), we have the following corollary:

Corollary 1. *Suppose that a distribution $\mathcal{P}$ of $(X_n)_{n \in N}$ is a compositional graphoid. Then, for every valid ordering of the nodes of G^N_{reg}, $\mathcal{P}$ satisfies the global Markov property with respect to G^N_{reg} if and only if it satisfies any one of $(P1)$, $(P2)$, $(P3)$, or $(P4)$.*

It is a consequence of the above results that in case one of the four pairwise independence properties is satisfied, all other three hold as well so that, depending on the purpose of an enquiry, each one of them may be used. This has been applied implicitly in model-fitting strategies; see e.g. Wermuth and Sadeghi (2012).

6 Discussion

For regression graphs and for distributions that are compositional graphoids, the equivalence of four different pairwise independence properties has been proven, two of which ($(P1)$ and $(P4)$) require a valid ordering of all variables. Together with the known equivalence of one of them, $(P2)$, to the global Markov property, this gives essential insights into regression-graph structures and, at the same time, into the structural independences constraints of such distributions, into those independences which hold irrespective of a given parametrization.

In principle, each of these pairwise Markov properties may lead to different strategies for model selection when a valid ordering is given. The general idea is to start with pairs with the highest orders and go backward on the ordering and at every step test the corresponding pairwise independence of any one of the pairwise Markov properties we use. For $(P1)$ and $(P2)$, this method increases the number of nodes in the conditioning set as we proceed. Given the equivalence of the pairwise Markov properties, and assuming that the underlying distribution is a compositional graphoid, each one of them may be chosen depending on the purpose.

The importance of the pairwise property given the past of a node pair, $(P1)$, is that independence constraints and pairwise dependences are defined in the same way, that is without any change in the conditioning set; see the explanations following the main factorization property in (1). This permits to complete a graph in a unique way and to understand which independence constraints have been imposed on this complete graph to obtain a selected graph having missing edges. Its disadvantage for testing purposes is that it may include too many variables as mere noise; see Altham (1984).

The conditioning set is largest for the past of any two non-adjacent nodes, $(P1)$, and smallest for the subset of this past containing just the parents of one of the two nodes, $(P4)$. The two other properties have conditioning sets of intermediate size, they may be larger than those for $(P4)$ but they are never larger than those for $(P1)$. This implies for a regression-graph what follows for distributions by the factorization in equation (1): variables outside the past of missing edges are not needed to characterize a regression-graph structure.

For tracing pathways of dependence, the pairwise property given the anterior set of a node, $(P2)$ is the essential one. Intervening at an inner node of any anterior path in an edge-minimal graph may, for instance with exclusively risks along the path, interrupt an otherwise disastrous accumulation of risk factors.

For any given joint response, property $(P4)$ justifies the elimination of unimportant regressors for each response component separately, just as in a Gaussian multivariate regression, but with property $(P3)$, that is by conditioning on the joint parents of two response nodes, estimation problems, which may arise in seemingly unrelated regressions, are avoided.

Efficient algorithms still need to be developed to decide for a general given distribution whether it satisfies the independence properties, (v) to (vii), which are not common to all probability distributions, and whether it contains only those structural independences provided by an edge-minimal regression graph capturing a possible generating process.

Acknowledgments

Work of the first author was partially supported by grant #FA9550-12-1-0392 from the U.S. Air Force Office of Scientific Research (AFOSR) and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA).

References

Altham, P. (1984). Improving the precision of estimation by fitting a model. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. B* **46**, 118–119.

Andersen P.K. and Skovgaard L.T. (2010). *Regression with linear predictors.* Springer, New York.

Box, G.E.P. and Wilson, K.B. (1951). On the experimental attainment of optimum conditions (with discussion). *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. B* **13**, 1–45.

Cox, D.R. and Wermuth, N. (1993). Linear dependencies represented by chain graphs (with discussion). *Statist. Science* **8**, 204–218; 247–277.

Cox, D.R. and Wermuth, N. (1994). Tests of linearity, multivariate normality and adequacy of linear scores. *Appl. Statist., J. Roy. Statist. Soc. C*, **43**, 347–355.

Darroch, J.N., Lauritzen, S.L., and Speed, T.P. (1980). Markov fields and log-linear models for contingency tables. *Ann. Statist.* **8**, 522 – 539.

Dawid, A.P. (1979). Conditional independence in statistical theory. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. B* **41**, 1 – 31.

Dempster, A. P. (1972). Covariance selection. *Biometrics* **28**, 157–175.

Drton, M. (2009). Discrete chain graph models. *Bernoulli* **15**, 736–753.

Ezekiel, M. (1926). The determination of curvilinear regression 'surfaces' in the presence of other variables. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **21**, 310–320.

Fallat, S., Lauritzen S., Sadeghi K., Uhler, C., Wermuth N. and Zwiernik, P. (2015). Total positivity in Markov structures. Submitted; also on ArXiv: 1510.01290.

Lauritzen, S.L. and Wermuth, N. (1989). Graphical models for associations between variables, some of which are qualitative and some quantitative. *Ann. Statist.* **17**, 31 – 54.

Lněnička, R. and Matúš, F. (2007). On Gaussian conditional independence structures. *Kybernetika* **43**, 323–342.

Marchetti, G.M. and Lupparelli, M. (2011). Chain graph models of multivariate regression type for categorical data. *Bernoulli*, **17**, 827–844.

McCullagh, P. and Nelder, J.A. (1989). *Generalized Linear Models*, 2nd ed. Chapman and Hall, London.

Pearl J. and Paz, A. (1987). Graphoids: a graph based logic for reasoning about relevancy relations. In: (eds. B.D. Boulay D. Hogg, and L. Steel) *Advances in Artificial Intelligence II*, North Holland, Amsterdam, 357–363.

Sadeghi, K. and Lauritzen, S.L. (2014). Markov properties for mixed graphs. *Bernoulli* **20**, 676–696.

Sadeghi K. and Marchetti, G.M. (2012). Graphical Markov models with mixed graphs in R. *The R Journal* **4**, 65–73.

Stanghellini, E. and Vantaggi, B. (2013). On the identification of discrete concentration graph models with one hidden binary variable. *Bernoulli* **19**, 1920–1937.

Studený, M. (1989). Multiinformation and the problem of characterization of conditional independence relations. *Problems of Control and Information Theory* **18**, 3–16.

Studený, M. (2005). *Probabilistic conditional independence structures*. Springer, London.

Weisberg, S. (2014). *Applied linear regression*, 4th edition. Wiley, Hoboken, New Jersey.

Wermuth, N. (2012). Traceable regressions. *Internat. Statist. Review* **80**, 415–438.

Wermuth, N. (2015). Graphical Markov models, unifying results and their interpretation. *Wiley Statsref: Statistics Reference Online*, also on Arxiv: 1505.02456.

Wermuth N. and Sadeghi, K. (2012). Sequences of regressions and their independences (with discussion). *TEST* **21**, 215–279.